



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,268	05/18/2006	Peter Vogel	10191/4275	8846
26646	7590	01/05/2009	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			WENDELL, ANDREW	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2618		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/05/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/564,268	Applicant(s) VOGEL ET AL.
	Examiner ANDREW WENDELL	Art Unit 2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 14,16-18 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 14,16-18 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/3/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 14, 16-18, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas (JP 2001-119451) in view of Yamanaka et al. (US Pat# 5,815,072).

Regarding claim 14, Andreas teaches a method for operating multimedia and/or telematics services 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1) in a motor vehicle 10 (Fig. 1), comprising providing the services in a speed-dependent manner (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15) wherein at least one service uses at least one input medium (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. receiving phone call or operating panel for the car radio), at least one service uses at least one output medium (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. making phone call

or audio output from radio or output from navigation system), the providing of the service includes providing at least one of a control of a selection of the services (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. controlling making calls, operability of the car radio, incoming calls, navigation announcements, etc.) and a representation of the services on a user interface 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1, every component has some sort of user interface in order to be able to use the components) present in the motor vehicle 10 (Fig. 1). Andreas fails to teach a visual output medium.

Yamanaka teaches at least one visual output medium that includes at least two display adaptations of one service (Col. 2 lines 22-54, multiple different colors display adaptations based on speed); and performing a speed-dependent 3 (Fig. 1) adaptation of the at least one visual output medium 26 (Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a visual output medium as taught by Yamanaka into Andreas vehicle controls in order to know the speed of the vehicle more easily and therefore traveling at safer speeds (Col. 3 lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 16, the combinations including Andreas teaches wherein the selection of the services includes a prioritization of predetermined services (based on vehicle speed can have priority on services, i.e. higher priority to receive calls when vehicle is below 130Km/h than when over 130Km/h the priority of receiving calls are lowered) over other services that are also available (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15).

Regarding claim 17, the combination including Andreas teaches performing a speed-dependent selection from among the at least two (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15) input mediums (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. receiving phone call or operating panel for the car radio) for an operator control of the at least one service that uses the at least two input mediums.

Regarding claim 18, the combination including Yamanaka teaches performing a speed-dependent selection from among the at least two output mediums for a representation of the at least one service that uses the at least two output mediums (Col. 2 lines 22-54).

Regarding claim 20, the combination including Andreas teaches performing a control involving a selection, based at least in part on the speed of the vehicle of a suitable form of representation of contents (car phone, car radio, navigation system) provided by the particular service on an output medium (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15).

Regarding claim 26, Andreas teaches a service management unit 15 (Fig. 1) for use in an operation of multimedia and/or telematics services 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1) and associated user interfaces, in a motor vehicle 10 (Fig. 1), comprising a control unit 15 (Fig. 1) for analyzing information on a vehicle speed (Page 3) and being configured for providing the services in a speed-dependent manner (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. controlling making calls, operability of the car radio, incoming calls, navigation announcements, etc.), wherein the providing of the service includes providing at least one of a control of a selection of the services (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. controlling making calls, operability of the car radio, incoming calls, navigation

announcements, etc.) and a representation of the services on a user interface 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1, every component has some sort of user interface in order to be able to use the components) present in the motor vehicle 10 (Fig. 1). Andreas fails teach a visual output medium.

Yamanaka teaches a visual output medium to display information about at least one service (information about speed and conditions) and the providing includes adapting the display of information in a speed-dependent manner (Col. 2 lines 22-54, adapting different colors on display relative to speed of vehicle).

4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas (JP 2001-119451) in view of Yamanaka et al. (US Pat# 5,815, 072) and further in view of Wawra et al. (US Pat# 6,714,860).

Regarding claim 21, Andreas in view of Yamanaka teaches the limitations in claim 14. Andreas and Yamanaka fail to teach providing controlled selection of advertisements as a function of the speed.

Yamanaka teaches an output medium in a manner controlled by a speed by performing at least one of the following: c) providing controlled selection of advertisements as a function of the speed (Col. 2 lines 54-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate providing controlled selection of advertisements as a function of the speed as taught by Wawra into a visual output medium as taught by Yamanaka into Andreas vehicle controls in order to improve navigation device with more views (Col. 1 lines 20-25).

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas (JP 2001-119451) in view of Yamanaka et al. (US Pat# 5,815, 072) and further in view of Breed (US Pat# 7,126,583).

Regarding claim 22, Andreas in view of Yamanaka teaches performing one of the following for adapting an input medium in a manner controlled by a speed a) assigning control elements, including keys, different functions, in which functions of greater importance being prioritized over those of less importance (Andreas: Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15), b) suppressing predetermined functions of predefined associated control elements (Andreas: Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15), c) blocking keys in one of an audibly perceptible manner, a visually perceptible manner, and a tactiley perceptible manner (Andreas: Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15).

Andreas and Yamanaka fail to teach changing one of a sensitivity characteristic of a microphone.

Breed teaches changing one of a sensitivity characteristic of a microphone and a directional characteristic of the microphone (Col. 17 lines 9-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate changing one of a sensitivity characteristic of a microphone as taught by Breed into a visual output medium as taught by Yamanaka into Andreas's vehicle controls in order to increase safety since the operator does not have to take their eyes off the road (Col. 13 lines 57-66).

6. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas (JP 2001-119451) in view of Yamanaka et al. (US Pat# 5,815, 072) and further in view of Toshio (JP 06-61923).

Regarding claim 23, Andreas in view of Yamanaka teaches the limitations in claim 14. Andreas and Yamanaka fail to teach selecting a transmission medium.

Toshio teaches selecting a transmission medium (selecting the correct base station to transmit based on speed) for communication and setting corresponding service parameters as a function of a speed (Figs. 2 and Section 0009).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate selecting a transmission medium as taught by Wakabayashi into a visual output medium as taught by Yamanaka into Andreas's vehicle controls in order to reduce deterioration of the speech quality (Purpose).

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas (JP 2001-119451) in view of Yamanaka et al. (US Pat# 5,815, 072) and further in view of O'Neil (US Pat# 6,973,333).

Regarding claim 24, Andreas in view of Yamanaka teaches the limitations in claim 14. Andreas and Yamanaka fail to teach performing a control in at least one of a location-dependent manner and a context-dependent manner.

O'Neil teaches performing a control in at least one of a location-dependent manner and a context-dependent manner (Col. 14 line 49-Col. 15 line 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate performing a control in at least one of a location-dependent manner and a context-dependent manner as taught by O'Neil into a visual output medium as taught by Yamanaka into Andreas's vehicle controls in order to increase flexibility in restricting the use of cellular telephones (Col. 2 lines 62-67).

8. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas (JP 2001-119451) in view of Damiani et al. (US Pat# 6,667,726) and further in view of Yamanaka et al. (US Pat# 5,815, 072).

Regarding claim 25, Andreas teaches a vehicle information system (Fig. 2) for operating services including at least one of multimedia services and telematics services 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1) and associated user interfaces in a motor vehicle 10 (Fig. 1), comprising a service management unit 15 (Fig. 1) connectable to a) a device for one of measuring and displaying an instantaneous vehicle speed 17.1 and 17.2 (Fig. 1 and Page 3), and b) a user interface 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1) for providing the services in a speed-dependent manner (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. controlling based on speed for making calls, operability of the car radio, incoming calls, navigation announcements, etc.), wherein the providing of the service includes providing at least one of a control of a selection of the services (Page 4 line 3-Page 5 line 15, i.e. controlling making calls, operability of the car radio, incoming calls, navigation announcements, etc.) and a representation of the services on a user interface 11, 12, or 13 (Fig. 1, every component has some sort of user interface in order to be able to use the components) present in

the motor vehicle 10 (Fig. 1). Andreas fails to clearly teach measuring instantaneous speed (even though it would be obvious) and a visual output medium.

Damiani teaches a device for one of measuring and displaying an instantaneous vehicle speed (Col. 3 lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate measuring instantaneous speed as taught by Damiani into Andreas's vehicle controls in order to increase visibility and therefore increase safety (Col. 1 lines 28-47).

Andreas and Damiani fail to teach a visual output medium

Yamanaka teaches a visual output medium to display information about at least one service (information about speed and conditions) and the providing includes adapting the display of information in a speed-dependent manner (Col. 2 lines 22-54, adapting different colors on display relative to speed of vehicle).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a visual output medium as taught by Yamanaka into measuring instantaneous speed as taught by Damiani into Andreas's vehicle controls in order to know the speed of the vehicle more easily and therefore traveling at safer speeds (Col. 3 lines 35-39)

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14, 16-18, and 20-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW WENDELL whose telephone number is (571)272-0557. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Wendell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

12/24/2008

/Quochien B Vuong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618